

REMARKS

Overview

Claims 1-5 and 8 are pending in the present application and all claims have been rejected.

Claim Rejections

The Examiner gave a final rejection but cited a new reference of Cooper, US Publication No. 2004/0237104 A1, arguing that the new reference was necessitated by Applicant's amendment and therefore a final rejection is proper. This amendment addresses certain clarifying matters and addresses the combination of the previously used Markman and Ma references with Cooper.

A number of minor amendments have been made to simply clarify that each of the Applicant's modules is assigned to a respective remote device, each module causing the transformation of the EPG information into a different dedicated format corresponding to each remote device.

The examiner's comments with respect to Ma, Markman and Cooper are noted, and it is agreed that Ma and Marker fail to disclose the client module transforming EPG information into a plurality of difference dedicated formats for display on a corresponding plurality of different remote devices. However, Applicant does not agree with the examiner's opinion that Cooper teaches this feature.

The apparatus of Cooper relates to a PVR device that allows a user to record a TV program in a conventional format and/or a format which is more appropriate for a mobile device (paragraph 6). The user selects which program to record and in which format, and the PVR encodes and stores the program in the appropriate format accordingly. As such Cooper teaches

that a broadcast program may be encoded and stored in different formats by the PVR, a first format which can be viewed on a normal TV, and a second format which can be exported and viewed on a mobile device (paragraph 18).

In contrast, the present invention relates to the transformation of EPG information into different formats, so that the EPG can be navigated using a remote device without interrupting the user viewing the main display, the EPG being provided in a dedicated format for the remote device so that the EPG can be optimally displayed on that remote device.

Cooper neither teaches the transformation of EPG information into different formats, nor indeed the provision of multiple client modules for respective multiple remote devices. As such if a user attempted to view the PVR EPG of Cooper via different remote devices, parts of the EPG may be non-visible due to incorrect formatting or not viewable at all if the format is not recognized.

Claim 1 defined overcomes the problem of Cooper and neither teaches the transformation of EPG invention into different formats to provide the provision of multiple client modules for a respectively multiple remote devices. If Applicant's claimed invention defines elements not present in the prior art (which it does) and achieves results that the prior art cannot achieve (which it also does), 35 U.S.C. § 103 and KSR International v. Teleflex, Inc., 27 S. Ct. 1727 (2007) mandate the claims are nonobvious subject matter. Reconsideration and allowance is requested.

It is noted that in the event the Examiner does not feel Applicant has placed the claims in condition for allowance they clearly are minor formatting matters that clarify and place the claims in better condition for purposes of appeal.

Conclusion

Please also consider this a Request for a One-Month Extension of Time from January 7, 2010 to February 7, 2010 and charge Deposit Account No. 26-0084 the amount of \$130.00 for this extension. No other fees or extensions of time are believed to be due in connection with this amendment; however, consider this a request for any extension inadvertently omitted, and charge any additional fees to Deposit Account No. 26-0084.

Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



EDMUND J. SEASE, Reg. No. 24,741
McKEE, VOORHEES & SEASE, P.L.C.
801 Grand Avenue, Suite 3200
Des Moines, Iowa 50309-2721
Phone No: (515) 288-3667
Fax No: (515) 288-1338
CUSTOMER NO: 22885

Attorneys of Record

- bjh -